



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/957,462	09/21/2001	Nobuhiko Nishimura	152/50453	2593	
7590 08/20/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
CROWELL & MORING, L.L.P.			FOOTLAND,	FOOTLAND, LENARD A	
P.O. Box 14300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, DC 20044-4300			ARTONII	PAPER NUMBER	
			3682		
			DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	,					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commons	09/957,462	NISHIMURA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Lenard A. Footland	3682				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 M	<u>ay 2004</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-2 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) A Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		ratent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/957,462

Art Unit: 3682

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kai et al. in view of Takemura et al.

The examiner finds that except for those shown by Takemura et al., Kai et al. discloses all of the claimed elements and functions, including, for example, a motor with a bearing.

The examiner finds that the Takemura et al. reference expressly discloses what Kai et al. does not, the conventionality of employing a bearing with a groove radius ratio in the claimed range (col. 3, lines 1-9) in order to increase durability (col. 2, lines 15-17, 49-50), as also sought by applicant. Applying the test for obviousness set forth in *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981), which is what the combined teaching of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art, the examiner finds that one having ordinary skill in the art would have found that providing the Kai et al. motor bearing with a groove

Application/Control Number: 09/957,462

Art Unit: 3682

radius ratio in the claimed range as taught by Takemura et al., would have been obvious in view of the teaching of Takemura et al. of doing so in order to increase durability.

Claim(s) 3-4 are allowed.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lenard A. Footland, whose telephone number is (703) 308-2683.

Fax: 703-872-9326

Lenard A. Footland

Timed A Foother

Primary Examiner Technology Center 3600 Art Unit 3682

laf August 18, 2004